

Applicant : Min Zhu
Appl. No. : 10/001,435
Examiner : Kamal B. Divecha
Docket No. : 16440.4015 (formerly M-11960US)

REMARKS

Claims 1, 11, and 32 have been amended, and new claims 33-37 have been added. Claims 1-2, 11-12, and 28-37 are pending in the application. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to make clear that none of the viewers participating in the data conference are located at the target computer. Claim 32 has been amended to make clear that the telephone number is accessed from the target computer in response to a user at the remote computer attempting to access the target computer.

Title

The Examiner stated that the title is not descriptive and suggested the title "Remote Access Session During Data Conferences." Applicants have amended the title based on the suggestion provided by the Examiner.

Double Patenting

Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 28-32 were rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,691,154 B1 in view of Slaughter, III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,598,536).

Rejections under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-2, 11-12, and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Slaughter, III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in view of Riddle (U.S. 2003/0187924 A1). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 is patentable because none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or suggests "enabling the remote computer to access an application on the target computer while the remote computer is participating in a data conference; and enabling the remote computer to share the application on the target computer with viewers participating in the data conference, wherein none of the viewers are located at the target computer." While Slaughter discloses accessing a computer network via a remote access server, Slaughter does not teach or suggest

Applicant : Min Zhu
Appl. No. : 10/001,435
Examiner : Kamal B. Divecha
Docket No. : 16440.4015 (formerly M-11960US)

accessing an application on a target computer while participating in a data conference and sharing the application on the target computer with others participating in the data conference, as required by claim 1. Riddle also fails to disclose this claim limitation. In Riddle, members of a teleconference are able to share applications running on their computers with other members (i.e., participants) of the teleconference. This sharing allows a member to access applications residing on another (i.e., remote) member's desktop (paragraph [0043]). However, Riddle does not disclose a member of the teleconference remotely accessing an application on a target computer that is not a member of the teleconference, and sharing the application on the target computer with other members of the teleconference. Rather, Riddle only discloses members sharing applications running on their own computer with other members. The claimed invention advantageously allows, e.g., a traveling business man in Paris to remotely access a PowerPoint presentation on his laptop (target computer) in San Francisco and share the PowerPoint presentation during a data conference with participants of the conference in New York (see paragraphs [0070]-[0072]). This is not provided for in Riddle, which only provides sharing of applications running on one of the member's (i.e., participant's) computer.

For the reasons given above, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references, and respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons given for claim 1.

Independent claim 11 has limitations similar to those of claim 1, and is patentable for similar reasons as claim 1.

Claims 12, and 28-30 depend from claim 11, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given for claim 11.

Claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Slaughter in view of Riddle, and further in view of Easley et al. (U.S. Pub No. 2002/0142842 A1). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 31 depends from claim 11, and is patentable for at least the reasons given above for claim 11.

Applicant : Min Zhu
Appl. No. : 10/001,435
Examiner : Kamal B. Divecha
Docket No. : 16440.4015 (formerly M-11960US)

Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Slaughter in view of Riddle, and further in view of Loveland (U.S. Patent No. 6,782,413 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 32 depends on claim 1, and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons given for claim 1. Claim 32 is additionally patentable because none of the cited references discloses, teaches or suggest a phone authentication procedure for remotely accessing a target computer comprising "in response to a user at the remote computer attempting to access the target computer, accessing a stored telephone number from the target computer" and "dialing the telephone number to call a user at the remote computer" (emphasis added). While Loveland discloses user authentication over a phone, Loveland does not teach or suggest accessing a stored telephone number from the target computer in response to an attempt by a user at the remote computer to access the target computer and dialing the telephone number to call a user at the remote computer to perform the authentication. Rather, the phone authentication procedure of Loveland involves receiving a call from the user requesting authentication over the phone (see column 20, lines 1-5 and step 600 "Receive Call From User" in Figure 8). The system of Loveland does not call the user in response to the user attempting to access a target computer, much less call the user using a telephone number received from the target computer that the user is attempting to access remotely. The portion of Loveland (column 16, line 6-15) relied upon by the Office Action actually discloses a user remotely accessing contact information from a PIM and dialing a client's phone number retrieved from the PIM. This is not part of Loveland's phone authentication procedure. FIG. 8 of Loveland explicitly shows the system of Loveland receiving a call from the user (step 600) to begin the phone authorization procedure, and not the system calling the user in response to the user attempting to access a target computer, as required by claim 32.

New claims 33-37

New claims 33-37 depend from claim 1, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given for claim 1.

Applicant : Min Zhu
Appl. No. : 10/001,435
Examiner : Kamal B. Divecha
Docket No. : 16440.4015 (formerly M-11960US)

Claims 33 is additionally patentable because none of the cited reference discloses wherein, when the target computer is started, the target computer automatically initiates and establishes a connection with the central computer. This feature advantageously allows greater security at the target computer by having the target computer automatically initiate and establish a connection with the central computer instead of having the central computer attempt to locate and connect to the target computer through the security layers of the target computer.

Claim 34 is additionally patentable because none of the cited references discloses wherein the remote computer disables an input device of the target computer or make a screen of the target computer blank. This feature advantageously prevents a person located at the target computer from viewing or interfering with the remote access session.

Claim 35 is additionally patentable because none of the cited references discloses wherein the remote computer set ups a user account on the central computer system, and the target computer logs onto the user account and downloads the remote access program from the central computer while logged onto the user account. This advantageously allows a user to easily set up a target computer for remote access by logging onto the user's account from the target computer and, while logged onto the user's account, downloading the remote access program onto the target computer from the central computer.

Claim 36 depends from claim 35, and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons given for claim 35. Claim 35 is additionally patentable because none of the cited references discloses the remote access program automatically initiating and establishing a connection with the central computer when the target computer is started. This feature advantageously allows greater security at the target computer as explained above.

Claim 37 depends from claim 36, and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons given for claim 36. Claim 37 is additionally patentable because none of the cited reference discloses a remote access program enables a user at the target computer to configure the remote access program to automatically connect the target computer to the central computer when the target computer is started or to connect the

Applicant : Min Zhu
Appl. No. : 10/001,435
Examiner : Kamal B. Divecha
Docket No. : 16440.4015 (formerly M-11960US)

target computer to the central computer when the remote access program is manually launched on the target computer.

Conclusion

If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (949) 567-6700.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge Counsel's Deposit Account No. 150665 for any necessary fees, and is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required and to credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account 150665.

Respectfully submitted,
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

Dated: March 16, 2007

By: Eugene W.M.

Eugene Worley
Reg. No. 47,186

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600
Irvine, CA 92614-2558
Tel. 949-567-6700
Fax: 949-567-6710
Customer Number: 34313